



SGVCOG Transportation Committee Approved Minutes

Date: February 15, 2018

Time: 4:00 PM

Location: Upper San Gabriel Valley Municipal Water District
602 E. Huntington Dr., Suite B, Monrovia, CA 91016

PRELIMINARY BUSINESS

1. Call to Order
The meeting was called to order at 4:15 p.m.

2. Pledge of Allegiance

3. Roll Call

Members Present

- Alhambra
- Diamond Bar
- Duarte
- El Monte
- La Cañada Flintridge
- San Gabriel
- South El Monte
- South Pasadena
- Walnut
- LA County District 1
- LA County District 5

- B. Messina
- D. Liu
- J. Fasana
- J. Velasco
- T. Walker
- J. Pu
- G. Olmos, J. Vasquez
- D. Mahmud
- M. Su
- W. Rehman
- D. Perry

Members Absent

- Claremont
- Glendora
- Temple City

SGVCOG Staff

- M. Creter
- M. Christoffels
- C. Cruz
- P. Duyshart
- S. Hernandez

4. Public Comment

No public comment.

5. Changes to Agenda Order: Identify emergency items arising after agenda posting and requiring action prior to next regular meeting

No changes to the agenda order.

CONSENT CALENDAR

6. Transportation Meeting Minutes: 01/18/2018

There was a motion to approve the consent calendar (M/S: T. Walker / B. Messina).

[MOTION PASSED]

AYES:	Alhambra, Diamond Bar, Duarte, El Monte, La Cañada Flintridge, South El Monte
NOES:	

ABSTAIN:	
ABSENT:	Alhambra, Claremont, Glendora, San Gabriel, South Pasadena, Temple City, Walnut, LA County District 1, LA County District 5

PRESENTATIONS

7. I-10 Express Lanes Project Update

R. Wolfe, the Executive Director of the SBCTA, opened this presentation by providing a brief introduction to, and background of, the SBCTA in general, and its I-10 Express Lanes Project. He then introduced P. Beauchamp, the SBCTA’s Director of Project Delivery, who delivered the majority of the presentation.

Ms. Beauchamp explained how San Bernardino County has seen its population triple since about 1970. As a result, there is a high volume of congestion and freeway traffic throughout a plethora of San Bernardino County’s traffic corridors; this especially applies to the I-10 Freeway, which is a highly frequented freeway by residents of San Bernardino County and neighboring counties. The SBCTA has been trying to find solutions which address the very high amount of congestion and slow-downs on the I-10 Freeway.

P. Beauchamp continued by saying how the SBCTA, after studies, reviews, and public outreach, reached the conclusion that an express lanes project on I-10 would bring traffic benefits to the corridor and to the whole San Bernardino County region. Thus, the SBCTA is commissioning the construction of a 33-mile Express Lanes project which will stretch along the I-10 from the LA County line at the west to the eastern edge of the City of Redlands at the east. Additionally, she mentioned how the first 10-mile segment, which will go from the LA County line to the I-15 interchange and connector, will be relatively easy to construct because there are no major rail or stream crossings along that stretch of the freeway.

One primary challenge for this overall project will be figuring out the transition of the Carpool Lane to Express Lanes at and around the LA County line, from Indian Hill Blvd. to Monte Vista Ave. The SBCTA and its partners must figure out how to make this transition as smooth and seamless as possible.

Also, there will be dynamic and tiered pricing throughout the Express Lanes system. Drivers will have a transponder which is switchable. There will be a discount rate for clean vehicles, and a low-income program, too.

As of now, the SBCTA has hired a project and construction firm to assist through this entire process and to provide design/build and procurement contracts.

Questions/Discussion: The following issues were discussed:

- One Committee member noted that he is a big fan of the Express Lanes system, and pointed out how commuters have shown over time that they are warmer to the idea of being charged tolls for special lanes on freeways.
- A Committee member pointed out how the SBCTA, and LA Metro, need to study more effective ways to integrate buses and other transit vehicles into the Express Lanes without disrupting traffic too much.
- Another Committee member asked if the San Bernardino County Express Lanes system can be fully integrated with the current system that LA County already uses on its Express Lanes.
- The issue of enforcement of the Express Lanes tolls also got brought up by multiple Committee members. It was also discussed how there can be privacy issues with checking the occupancy of vehicles.

ACTION ITEMS

8. ACE Program Project Development, Evaluation, and Approval Process

M. Creter and M. Christoffels presented on this item. They first mentioned how the goal is to bring a final draft review process to the Governing Board for official approval in May.

The reason why the SGVCOG needs to draft a new thorough project selection process is the Governing Board approved the new ACE Program to take on a wider array of capital construction projects besides just Alameda Corridor East projects. M. Creter went on to say that COG staff is looking for feedback, guidance, and direction on all aspects of the drafts of the project selection and approval processes.

M. Creter then went on to describe the proposed project selection process for Funded Projects. This overall process consists of five sub-processes: Threshold Criteria, Review, Negotiation, Programming, and Annual Updates. For the Threshold Criteria Process, project sponsors will submit Letters of Interest (LOI) to the SGVCOG/ACE. The LOI will be relatively simple to fill out, and should not be overly time-intensive, because the COG wants to devise an easy project submission process for cities, to encourage more participation. This submission process will not be as intensive as a Metro call for projects scenario. The LOI will include sections regarding Project Description, Project Benefits, and a Statement of Need, among other sections. The Statement of Need will be weighted heavily, as the COG wants to assist cities which have resource limitations. Once the COG/ACE's call for projects is complete, the Governing Board will provide direction to staff regarding which projects are to proceed to the Review Phase, and this requires a majority vote of 19 agencies to proceed.

M. Creter proceeded to discuss the next step in the process, which is the Review Process. During this process, a Project Manager will provide a recommendation to the COG/ACE Chief Engineer regarding which projects are most viable and ready. These selected projects will then move on to the Negotiation Phase, which is Step 3 in the overarching process. As part of the Negotiation Phase, a Project Manager will prepare a draft master agreement for a selected project, the Chief Engineer and Project Manager will meet with the City Manager or other sponsoring agency contacts to review the proposed agreement, and the project sponsor provides a letter of commitment to the COG; this letter will indicate interest in having the COG manage the project. Moreover, the 4th step in the project selection and evaluation process is the Programming Stage, in which the Project Managers and Chief Engineer create a 5-year workplan of projects which make it past the Negotiation Phase, the COG Executive Director presents this workplan to the Governing Board for approval, and each individual agency-to-agency project agreement would also be submitted separately for approval by the Governing Board, too. Then, the final step in the process is the Annual Updates Process, which consists of the Governing Board reviewing the 5-year workplan every Spring.

M. Creter then went on to discuss the project review and approval process for Unfunded Projects. The five sub-processes for the Unfunded Projects Process are the same as they are for the Funded Project Process, but there are key structural differences. The steps during the Threshold Criteria and LOI sub-process are the same as for Funded Projects. For the Review Process, a Project Manager and the Director of Community and Government Relations reviews the LOI and schedules a meeting with the sponsoring agency, and then the former two individuals provide a recommendation to the Executive Director regarding whether or not the project should proceed to Negotiation. During the Negotiation Phase, a project manager will draft an MOU instead of a contract. Moreover, the COG will charge an annual flat fee to sponsoring agencies for the COG's services: the annual flat fee will be \$5,000 or \$10,000, depending on the project type. The Programming Stage for Unfunded Projects is the same as it is for Funded Projects. The Annual Updates Requirement is similar, too; however, if a project is successfully awarded funding, then the project sponsor may choose to submit the project for COG implementation.

M. Christoffels mentioned how if the COG and ACE get a lot of LOIs, then the COG would have to address issues with staff capacity. He reminded Committee members that one of the main purposes of the COG’s role here is to play an advocacy role in securing funding and resources for cities’ processes.

Questions/Discussion: The following issues were discussed:

- One Committee member asked if the Governing Board had already agreed to establish the Government Relations position. Christoffels and Creter both pointed out that ACE already has a Director of Government Relations, and that Paul Hubler currently occupies this decision.
- A second Committee member asked how funding will be allocated. Both Christoffels and Creter replied that the COG is not awarding funding for projects as part of this process; the COG is providing a mechanism to sponsor projects and move projects forward and closer to either completion for funding projects or to shovel ready for unfunded projects. The COG will also be able to help cities identify funding, too.
- M. Creter also remarked how this capital project approval process is a completely separate process from the actual programming of Metro Measure M MSP 5-Year Subregional Program Plan funding.
- Another Committee member said that staff has created a well-conceived and thorough draft proposal.
- Additionally, a member asked about the principles of the framework of this process, and asked about the structures for processes like this one from other Southern California COGs.
- Also, a Committee member asked how SB 1 funding may or may not affect this project evaluation process.

There was a motion to move this item as presented to the SGVCOG Executive Committee for further review, discussion, and deliberation. (M/S: B. Messina / J. Velasco)

[MOTION PASSED]

AYES:	Alhambra, Diamond Bar, Duarte, El Monte, La Cañada Flintridge, San Gabriel, South El Monte, South Pasadena, Walnut, LA County District 1, LA County District 5
NOES:	
ABSTAIN:	
ABSENT:	Claremont, Glendora, Temple City

DISCUSSION ITEMS

METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY (MTA) REPORT

9. Oral Report

The Chair, J. Fasana, provided the MTA Report.

- Metro is celebrating 25 years as an agency. There was a press conference earlier today about that.
- Metro is currently studying how to allocate funding to multiple jurisdictions across LA County.

UPDATE ITEMS

10. Metrolink Update

W. Rehman of Supervisor Hilda Solis’s Office reported that County Supervisors made a motion to have the Dodger Stadium Express Metrolink Train. County Staff has now been tasked with figuring out how far into San Bernardino County this train should go.

Additionally, a Metrolink Staff also let Committee members know that Metrolink recently sent a notice to the City of San Gabriel that a test train will be going through their city in the early morning hours. Additionally, she announced that Metrolink will be holding a special event in April, and quickly briefed the Committee on Southern California Optimized Rail Expansion, known as SCORE.

J. Fasana also announced that the Claremont Metrolink Station will be preserved.

11. Update on Active Transportation Planning Efforts

M. Creter presented on this item. First, she reminded the Committee about the COG's CicLAvia event on April 22. Second, she let the Committee know about two great transportation grant opportunities: the Caltrans Sustainable Communities grant, and the Urban Greening Program. The SGVCOG is currently working on applications for both of these grants to assist cities in obtaining active transportation project money.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT

12. Oral Report

There was no report on this item.

COMMITTEE MEMBER ITEMS

No Committee member items.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Lisa Levy Bush of the Foothill Gold Line Extension Construction Authority announced that a couple of key milestones pertaining to the Glendora to Montclair Phase 2B project were recently completed: 17 groups submitted statements of qualifications, and the Authority also sent out RFP and procurement documents, too.

ADJOURN

The meeting was adjourned at 5:17 p.m.